DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 228 CS 210 602

AUTHOR Seiter, Danny; And Others
TITLE The United States vs. Edwin W. Edwards et al: The Role of Louisiana Dailies in Covering a Federal Prosecution.
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (70th, San Antonio, TX, August 1-4, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Content Analysis; *Crime; Crime Prevention; Journalism; *Mass Media Effects; Media Research; *Newspapers; *News Reporting; Responsibility; Violence
IDENTIFIERS Louisiana; News Stories; News Topics; News Values

ABSTRACT

A study examined whether the media in Louisiana have reflected current media trends of emphasis on crime news, focusing on crime news content in the 24 Louisiana daily newspapers. Since a key part of the research was the comparison of trends in newspaper accounts of crime and the reported crime rate, the 22 communities with daily newspapers were grouped by city size rather than by circulation. Two one-week periods from 1980 and 1985 were randomly chosen for analysis of crime content. Crime news was defined as any item concerning law breaking by adults or juveniles, as well as those items focusing on crime as a social problem, methods of crime prevention, and crime rate increases and decreases. Results indicated that overall, crime news in Louisiana dailies increased from 1980 to 1985. Crime prevention items, for example, increased significantly by more than 200%. Such an increase suggests cooperation between newspapers and law enforcement agencies. Results also indicated that more crime news was published on the front pages of Louisiana dailies in 1985 than in 1980, suggesting that violent crimes are accorded a statistically unwarranted status in the media when the ratio of violent crime to all other crimes is considered. Findings suggested that in 1985 Louisiana newspapers portrayed a picture of crime on the increase, a picture not totally consistent with officially reported crime statistics. (Tables of data are included, and footnotes are appended.) (NKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED284228

The United States vs. Edwin W. Edwards et al:

The Role of Louisiana Dailies in Covering a Federal Prosecution

by

Danny Seiter
John W. Windhauser
Manship School of Journalism
Louisiana State University

L. Thomas Winfree
Department of Criminal Justice
New Mexico State University

and

Birthney Ardoin
Division of Communication
Pepperdine University

Paper presented to the Newspaper Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas, August 1987.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John Windhauser

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS210602

Media have traditionally gravitated toward sensational trials involving prominent members of society, as seen by the pandemonium that characterized the 1954 trial of Cleveland physician Sam Sheppard, who was ultimately convicted of a particularly grisly murder, and 1965 trial of Texas oil millionaire Billy Sol Estes, a longtime friend of then President Lyndon B. Johnson. In fact, due to the unprecedented pre-trial and trial publicity, described by some as a Roman holiday, complete with carnival atmosphere (Neubauer, 1984:302), Sheppard was able to win another trial (Sheppard v. Maxwell, 384 U.S. 333, 1966). The operating assumption, here, is that the various media should present accurate details and balanced treatment of the operation of the court process (Garofalo, 1981: 343; Dominick, 1978: 124-5; Chibnall, 1975; but see too Eisenstein and Jacob, 1977: 92-4, 123, 167; Jacob, 1984: 152-58). The public, for its part, is understandably curious about such spectacles, so much so that some students of criminal justice refer to them as "celebrated cases" and question their value to the study of justice in America (Friedman and Percival, 1981; Walker, 1985; see too Dominick, 1981: 121).

In the past decade, the vigorous enforcement of the Racketeering Influence and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) statutes have provided a number of "celebrity cases" in the 1980s (see Walker, 1985:17; Friedman and Percival, 1981). Included among the targets of the federal prosecutors have been not only the

"traditional" organized crime figures in New York City and elsewhere but also a new type of offender in ABSCAM and BRILAB: the corrupt politician and influence peddler (Rhodes, 1984: 257-8). Thus, while these celebrity cases are somewhat infrequent events and no doubt focus on rather rarified issues, they are significant for criminal justice in that they expand our definitions of crime and the criminal beyond the violent street offender (see too Pepinsky and Jesilow, 1985; Bohm, 1986).

As a case in point, few subjects so absorbed the attention of Louisiana's media and public, and for a while the nation, as the 1985 racketeering trial in New Orleans of Governor Edwin Edwards[1] and seven of his associates. Long a flamboyant figure in state politics, Edwards has used an ineffable charisma and disarming frankness to win an unprecedented three terms as governor, sidestepping several grand jury investigations along the way. Added to the governor's personality was the natural drama that comes from a courtroom setting. Attorneys attempt to catch inconsistencies, or downright lies, in the testimony of witnesses, and witnesses through their responses sometimes reveal aspects of their character that are rarely seen in the less emotionally-charged situations of everyday life (Neubauer, 1984: 295). Edwards, for example, was upset by revelations during the trial that several well-publicized trips to Las Vegas casinos had proven very costly, with losses of over $200,000 at a time. Such losses had never been reported in the newspapers. It was never clear whether the governor was miffed over the revelations themselves or the fact that his image as a high-rolling, high-

living winner had been tarnished. After all, he lost in Las Vegas.

After 13 weeks of testimony the jury could not reach a verdict on Edwards and a mistrial was declared December 18, 1985. Four of his co-defendants, Gus Mijalis, James Wyllie Jr., Ronald Falgout, and Marion Edwards, the governor's brother, also saw their cases end in mistrials. The other three defendants, Philip S. Brooks, Perry Segura and Charles David Isabell, were acquitted on December 9.

The trial was the closest legal battle to date for Edwards, who had often been the object of grand jury investigations and controversy during his political life, in a state famous for political corruption and bravado. By any standards, then, this trial had, from the initial handing down of the indictments, all the earmarks of a "media-event trial," or a trial in which the evidence is presented and the defendant tried in the print and electronic media, such as was the case for Sheppard and Estes. The present study applies events coverage analysis, a type of content analysis, to the Edwards trial in order to analyze the completeness and fairness (equity) of Louisiana largest daily newspapers' coverage from the first drop of the gavel by Judge Marcel Livaudais to the declaration of a mistrial, some 13 weeks later.

METHOD

The 14 Louisiana daily newspapers with circulations of more than 10,000 were studied for a 96-day period from September 15, 1985, the Sunday before the trial started, to December 19, 1985,

the day after the trial ended. Each trial event was coded as to newspaper, time period[2], placement of the event[3], overall headline[4], and the type of the event.

The events coverage technique, developed in 1960 by Wayne Danielson (Danielson and Adams, 1961) and used by others (Windhauser, 1975/76; Stovall, 1982) was employed to study the trial coverage. For the purpose of this study, "an event has taken place if one assertion or more made at a particular time and place by a primary source (or by a secondary source or issue) is reported in at least 100 words in the news columns of any one of the chose newspapers" (Danielson and Adams, 1961:443).

"Primary sources" were defined as Governor Edwards, his co-defendants, their attorneys, the prosecutors, and Judge Livaudais. "Secondary sources" were present and former state officials, relatives of primary sources, national figures, and the media themselves. "Particular time" meant a 24-hour day beginning at midnight. "Particular place" meant within the boundaries of the state, usually Louisiana. Issues allowed for secondary sources included the condition of Louisiana government during the trial and Louisiana's national image.

Events were separated into eight categories. The first five followed the progress of the trial and can be called "courtroom events": (1) Jury Selection and Opening Arguments, (2) Witness for the Prosecution, (3) Witnesses for the Defense, (4) Jury Instruction/Jury Deliberation, and (5) Declaration of Mistrial/Reactions. The sixth category, called "extrajudical coverage," comprised events that were related to the trial and

were not precipitated by media activities. An example was a September 19 report that Marion Edwards had turned over the bulk of his financial assets to his wife, ostensibly for health reasons and his history of liver cancer. Most extrajudicial events took place outside the courtroom, but some events were considered extrajudical even though they occurred in the courtroom. These events were not part of testimony. An example was Judge Livaudais leading the court in a round of applause for the jurors, who braved Hurricane Juan October 30 to come to court.

A seventh category was called "media events", and included coverage that was judged to have been caused primarily because of the media's involvement in the case. The most prominent examples of media events were stories written on days when the trial was not in session. These reports rarely provided new information, but instead reviewed past events. Other examples of media events included a request from a radio journalist to Judge Livaudais to allow cameras and recording equipment into the courtroom for broadcast coverage, the judge's refusal of the request, opinion columns that did not appear on the editorial page, and brief press conferences by Edwards or attorneys on the courthouse steps.

An eighth category was included to examine editorials, opinion columns on the editorial page, and letters to the editor. Editorial cartoons, because they do not take a prose form, were not included in the category, but a running count of cartoons was kept for each newspaper.

RESULTS

The Charges

Edwards and his associates were charged with violating the conspiracy section of the federal Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) Law.[5] The governor and six of the seven co-defendants were also charged with 22 counts of mail fraud and 27 counts of wire fraud. The men were indicted on February 28, 1985. In 1982, the indictment charged, Edwards became partners with co-defendants Ronald Falgout and James Wyllie in corporations that were formed in order to obtain state approval for new hospitals and nursing homes in Louisiana. Certificates of approval, often the objects of intense competition among health-care organizations, enable health-care unit developers to receive significant federal funds.

The indictment alleged that Edwards and the other defendants sold their corporations and the certificates that came with them to major health-care developers who needed the certificates. The indictment charged further that Edwards, upon being re-elected governor in 1984, used his administrative powers to the benefit of his corporation by having their projects approved and by directing parties interested in building nursing homes to persons connected with his enterprise.

The Events

A summarized in Table 1, almost 70% of the 465 different events found were not direct news accounts from actual trial

testimony and activities, but rather were extrajudicial, editorial page, and media events. The five event types that directly followed the trial's testimony accounted for 31% of all the events, while media events alone totaled 27%.

//Table 1 About Here//

However, there were differences by newspaper. As a group, the state's newspapers consistently reported the events directly produced by the trial's progress, while most media events were reported by only one or two newspapers. For example, a letter to the editor or an editorial counted as an event, but was only published in one newspaper. A "courtroom event" such as the testimony of Edwards also counted as only one event, but was reported by all 14 daily newspapers.

Another way to view the events is to look at the sum total of all events covered by the 14 daily newspapers, rather than simply looking at the unique events. Viewed this way, "courtroom"-related events accounted for almost 57% of the 2,374 total events reported (Table 1). Witnesses for the prosecution accounted for nearly one-quarter of the sum of all events, while they were only slightly more than 13% of the unique events found in the newspapers. Media events, however, still explained almost 20%.

Events coverage by newspaper is presented in Table 2. The newspaper that reported the most about the New Orleans' events was the Shreveport Times, with 240, or slightly more than half of the total events. The other Gannett Corporation newspaper in Louisiana --- the Monroe News Star World --- and the Baton Rouge

Morning Advocate were next with 223 events reported each. Only three other newspapers reported more than 40% of the 465 events.

//Table 2 About Here//

Oddly enough, the New Orleans Times-Picayune/States-Items, was not the leader in coverage about the New Orleans trial. Four newspapers reported as many or more events than the Times-Picayune/States-Item; two of those newspapers are located in extreme Northern Louisiana, more than 200 miles from New Orleans. The only other Northern Louisiana newspaper included in the study, the Shreveport Journal, was seventh of the 14 publications studied in number of events reported.

Events coverage by topic and newspaper, also presented in Table 2, provides clues for the Gannett papers' strong coverage. The Shreveport Times and Monroe News Star World were first and second, respectively, in number of media events reported. Both papers also had strong performances in every other event category. However, these figures overlook an important pragmatic fact of reporting: John Hill, who works in Gannett's Baton Rouge bureau, provided most of the coverage for the Times and News Star World. His twice-weekly "reporter's notebooks" column, which chronicled the offbeat and more colorful aspects of the trial, was the main reason that the Gannett papers led in media events.

Table 2 further shows that most of the newspapers were fairly consistent in their coverage, at least by event types. Most of the papers covered at least two-thirds of all trial-related events, but only between 11% and 35% of the out-of-court events.

There are a few substantively significant exceptions to this observation. First of all, the completeness of the judicially related events coverage in both Baton Rouge newspapers, the New Orleans paper and the Shreveport Times, and Monroe's News Star World was far higher than in the other papers in the state. These same five papers carried among the highest overall percentages of total events covered, ranging from 40.4% to 51.6%. For comparison purposes, the other papers ranged from a low of 20.6% in the Hammond Daily Star to a high of 40.9% in Lake Charles' American Press. The significance of these numbers is found in the fact that the five papers with the most complete trial-related and overall coverage were also those that endorsed Governor Edward's opponent, David Treen, for governor in 1983.[6]

Story Placement and Headline Treatment

The trial events were front-page news, but just barely (Table 3). Front-page news items tended to be courtroom activities. Coverage of extrajudicial events and media events, meanwhile, were usually relegated to the inside pages. Almost 70% of the extrajudicial events were published on inside pages, joined by about 60% of the media events coverage.

//Table 3 About Here//

Headline treatment is a solid indicator of the newsworthiness of a story. As related in Table 4, the overriding majority of the headlines for the trial were "spread" headlines or two-column headlines. Spread headlines, which traversed more than two columns of type but did not meet the criteria for "banner" headlines, accounted for almost 45% of the total; two-

column headlines represented a quarter of the total. Major one-column headlines (12.4%) were almost as common as the more eye-catching and spectacular banner headlines (15.3%). Thus, while the majority of the trial's events made the front page, they were not always part of the most prominently displayed story on the page. As expected, the largest percentages of banner headlines ran during jury deliberations (24.9%) and when the mistrial was declared (39.3%).

//Table 4 About Here//

It was expected that the time period would play a major role in events coverage, and as anticipated, the largest concentrations of events presented in Table 5 were in the first and last two-week time periods of the 14-week trial. The last time period, even though two days shorter than the others, claimed the highest total of events with almost 19%, while the first time period accounted for almost 17%. Still, there is remarkable consistency of reporting throughout the entire time period, with the exception of the sixth time period (November 24-December 7).

//Table 5 About Here//

When broken down into event types, it was found that the largest concentration of extrajudicial and media events were still found in the first and last time periods. However, editorial events were found to not follow the pattern; the largest concentration of those events came during the fifth time period (November 10-23), when the defense presented the majority of its witnesses. The penultimate time period, from November 24

to December 7, was the only one to finish with less than 10% of the total events. This is easily explained for two reasons: First, the trial recessed for five days during the Thanksgiving holidays, and second, Edwards' three days of testimony on December 3, 4, and 5 monopolized coverage and further decreased the total number of events for that time period.

Media Sources and the Edwards Trial

Most Louisiana newspaper editors covered the New Orleans trial by relying on the wire services or assigning coverage responsibility to a bureau reporter. Only 16% of the events were covered by staff reporters, as shown in Table 6. The seven papers that received more than half of their event coverage from bureau or staff journalists accounted for seven of the top eight positions in the number of events reported. These seven papers all reported at least 36% of the trial's events.

//Table 6 About Here//

Nothing of note emerged when media source statistics were analyzed in their relation to event types. The numbers remained fairly constant, except that staff-reported events nearly doubled when the mistrial was declared, from 16 to almost 31%. This is easily explained by the fact that many newspapers developed local stories on reactions from legislators and citizens to the verdict, even those newspapers that relied on wire copy throughout most of the trial.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Trial coverage by the New Orleans Times-Picayune/States-Item was instructive if only by its brevity. Even though it has by far

the largest-circulation of any newspaper in the state and was the closest to the trial site, it managed to cover only the fourth-highest total of events. It was matched in number of events covered by the Lake Charles American Press, a much smaller daily that relied almost completely on wire copy for coverage. The Times-Picayune/States-Item often told its readers that the trial was a bore above all else. Reporter Bill Grady celebrated the long-awaited testimony on December 3 of Edwards, who can always be depended on for a good laugh or two: "His appearance on the witness stand was like the coming of a Messiah who would lead people out of the deadly Valley of Bore." ("Edwards shaky," 1985). Another story described the cameramen's ennui in waiting for photo opportunities: "The photographers and cameramen waiting outside the courthouse ... say there are three pictures: the Governor Arrives; the Governor Goes to Lunch; and the Governor Leaves for the Day. The rest of the time, they usually just hang around." ("False alarms, 1985). The Times-Picayune/States-Item also placed low in the number of events reported on the front page and in the use of photography. The paper's casual treatment of the trial, however, could merely have been a reflection of many Louisianians' indifferent attitudes toward accusations of corruption.

The perspective reflected in the Baton Rouge newspapers was anything but casual. As mentioned before, both the Morning Advocate and the State Times ran a majority of the trial's events on the front page, and on six occasions reported events with dispatches of 90 inches or more. One study in the State Times

reviewing the trial's testimony ran for a numbing 133 inches. The Morning Advocate also consistently ran "The Charges," which briefly outlined the government's accusations against each defendant.

The Baton Rouge papers and many others published often meaningless "review" stories and Monday "preview" stories. Such stories, which could only be considered media events, reported no new information and only regurgitated past testimony. These stories provided a clear example of the trial's importance on the papers' news agendas: Editors were willing to rerun copy in lieu of no new developments.

Also it was surprising that only seven of the 26 Louisiana dailies sent staff or bureau reporters to the trial, but many papers simply could not afford to house reporters in New Orleans for 14 weeks. Some papers, while within easy driving distance of New Orleans, could not spare one of their few reporters for such a long time. Such was the case with the two Slidell dailies, the Times and Sentry News.[5] Slidell is only 30 miles from New Orleans.

Most of the 14 newspapers studied chose to ignore the trial in their editorials until it was over. The Shreveport Times was harshest in its editorial treatment of Edwards, who joked throughout the trial and even appeared at the proceedings one day driving a horse and buggy. "But we aren't laughing," a Nov. 24 Times editorial said (1985). When the mistrial was declared, the Times immediately called for the defendants to be re-tried ("A new trial, "1985).

The Times' counterpart in Shreveport, the Journal, seemed to treat Edwards the most favorably of the 14 newspapers studied. Their editorial after the mistrial called for the jury's verdict to end the case once and for all ("Time to move on," 1985). The Journal also reported the majority of the events judged to have been favorably "slanted" toward Edwards, and three of the four events judged to have been "slanted" against chief prosecuting attorney John Volz.

Overall, the trial coverage was neutral, with no apparent overall slant. Many of the editorials were even judged to have been neutral. Those opinion columns decried the poor image that the trial was giving the state, but took no real editorial position as to what should be done. Some state newspapers gave virtually no editorial treatment to the trial in any form, be it from editorials, columnists, or letters to the editor. The Lafayette Advertiser published no editorial events. The Hammond Star had only one, a letter to the editor, and the Shreveport Journal had only two: the aforementioned editorial after the mistrial; and a letter to the editor accusing a reporter of slanted reporting. However, while the direction of the stories may not have projected a particular slant, the quantity of stories did suggest a possible bias. Five of six papers that specifically endorsed Edwards' chief opponent in the 1983 gubernatorial election gave the entire trial--- but particularly the judicial events --- far more comprehensive coverage than the other nine papers in the state. All in all, however, it does not appear that the newspapers of the state did much more than simply

report the events as they unfolded.

In conclusion, the first federal trial of Edwin W. Edwards and his associates for violations of the RICO statutes and various charges of federal mail and wire fraud was anything but a media circus, in spite of the fact that even within the state of Louisiana coverage varied widely. For all his supercilious manners and flamboyant life-style, perhaps Louisianians --- and included in this group are the reporters that covered the trial and the editors that approved their stories --- had difficulty seeing their governor as a "gangster" or "racketeer". Unethical, maybe, but, after all, he was just doing what so many others had done before him: He made a little money out of his connections. As John Maginnis, author of a book highly critical of Edwards, has observed, the state's undertaxed citizens do not give to give a damn about state government (Maginnis, 1984).

Alternately, perhaps this phenomenon can be understood in terms of the lack of notoriety surrounding the charges. After all, the government's case to the contrary, Edwards was not on trial for gambling or espousing a rather ostentatious life style. He was accused of misusing the office of the governor for personal profit. There were no dead bodies or smoking guns. In spite of the flamboyant nature of the central character, not to mention his counsel in court, this remained, after all, a rather straightforward "paper" case in which the government had to prove the presence of a criminal enterprise.

The central legal issues of the case were deeply rooted in the convoluted and obscure language of the RICO statutes

themselves. The statutes have been the subject of considerable legal scrutiny as to their fundamental definitions, particularly the definitions of a racketeer and a criminal enterprise, and the vagueness of the statute, which some claim allows for rather broad application by overzealous prosecutors (Rhodes, 1984: 221-25; Abadinsky, 1985:269-70). Often the cases are extremely complex, making presentation by lawyers difficult let alone untanglement by juries; and, the heavy criminal and civil tariffs associated with conviction has resulted, according to some legal scholars, in low conviction rates (Rubenstein and Reuter, 1978). As the Louisiana newspapers were fond of reminding their readers, the legal facts in the Edwards' case were complex and perplexing indeed. In the final analysis, just as the jury was confused about the final verdict in this first trial, perhaps the media --- and the reading public --- shared in this confusion.

NOTES

[1]There were two Edwards's on trial, Governor Edwin W. Edwards and his brother, Marion Edwards. Unless otherwise indicated, "Edwards" refers to Edwin W. Edwards.

[2]Events coverage for the 96-day period was separated into seven time segments. The first six were two-week periods, and the seventh was a 12-day period.

[3]Events were designated by their placement in the newspaper as either "front page", "inside page", or "editorial page". An inside page was any page that was not the first page (1A or Front Page) or an editorial page. For instance, the New Orleans Times-Picayune/States-Item covered many of the trial's events on the front page of its metropolitan section. These accounts were still considered "inside pages."

[4]Every event headline was classified into one of five headline categories. These categories included the following: (1) a banner, a headline across the top of the page; (2) a spread head, a headline more than two column wide but not extending across the entire page; (3) a two-column head, a headline two-columns wide; (4) a major one-column headline. See Stempel and Windhauser (1984) for more information concerning the categories.

[5]The key RICO (18 U.S.C. Sections 1962) passage reads as follows:

> Section 1962. Prohibited activities.
>
> (a) It shall be unlawful for any person who has received any income derived, directly or indirectly, from a pattern of racketeering activity or through collection of an unlawful debt... to use or invest, directly or indirectly, any part of

such income, or the proceeds of such income, in acquisition of any interest in, or the establishment or operation of, any enterprise which is engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce. A purchase of securities on the open market for purposes of investment, and without the intention of controlling or participating in the control of the issuer, or of assisting another to do so, shall not be unlawful under this subsection in the securities of the issuer held by the purchaser, the members of his immediate family, or his or their accomplices in any pattern of racketeering activity or the collection of an unlawful debt after such purchase do not amount in the aggregate to one percent of the outstanding securities of any one class, and do not confer, either in law or in fact, the power to elect one or more directors of the issuer.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person through a pattern of racketeering activity or through collection of an unlawful debt to acquire or maintain directly or indirectly any interest in or control of any enterprise which is engaged in, or the activities of which affect interstate or foreign commerce.

(c) It shall be unlawful for any person employed by or associated with any enterprise engaged in, or the activities of which affect interstate or foreign commerce, to conduct or participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such enterprise's affairs through a pattern of racketeering activity or collection of unlawful debt.

(d) It shall be unlawful for any person to conspire to violate any of the provisions of subsections (a), (b), or (c) of this section.

[6] Telephone interviews were conducted with the respective newspaper editors on February 27, 1987. A total of six papers supported David Treen, Edwards' chief opponent. They included the following papers: New Orleans Times-Picayune/States-Item, Baton Rouge's Morning Advocate and States-Times, Shreveport's Times, Monroe's News Star World, and Opelousas' World. Lafayette's Advertiser and Shreveport's Journal alone of the 14 papers publicly endorsed Edwards. The remaining six papers made no formal endorsements of any candidates.

Table 1

Unique Events and Sum of Events Covered for
Content Categories as Reported by 14 Louisiana Newspapers

Event Type	Unique Events Reported N	%	Sum of Events Coverage N	%	Ratio of Events Coverage Per Event
(A) Jury selection/opening args.	23	4.9	208	8.0	9:1
(B) Witnesses for prosecution	61	13.1	573	24.1	9.4:1
(C) Witnesses for defense	37	8.0	335	14.1	9.05:1
(D) Closing args./Jury delib.	18	3.9	194	8.2	10.7:1
(E) Declaration of mistrial	6	1.3	56	2.4	9.3:1
(F) Extrajudicial	100	21.5	398	16.8	4:1
(G) Media events	126	27.1	459	19.3	3.6:1
(H) Editorial page events	94	20.2	151	6.4	1.6:1
TOTALS	465	100.0	2,374	100.0	5.1:1

Table 2

Percentage of Total Events Reported by Newspaper

Newspapers	Event Categories								
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)
Times-Picayune	73.9	80.3	73.0	94.4	100.0	44.0	15.1	11.7	40.9
M'ing Advocate	87.0	88.5	83.3	88.9	83.3	47.0	32.5	9.6	48.0
S'port Times	78.3	83.6	83.8	83.3	83.3	38.0	50.0	20.2	51.6
State Times	73.9	90.2	81.1	88.9	66.7	37.0	17.5	7.4	40.4
American Press	60.9	67.2	59.5	83.3	66.7	38.0	31.0	18.1	40.9
Advertiser	39.1	68.9	64.9	64.9	66.7	18.0	22.1	0.0	30.1
Town Talk	60.9	60.7	56.8	72.2	*	23.4	23.5	19.7	32.9
News Star World	73.9	83.6	81.1	72.2	83.3	25.0	44.4	16.0	48.6
Journal	60.9	72.1	75.7	66.7	83.3	25.0	35.7	2.1	37.6
Courier	60.9	65.6	59.5	72.2	83.3	22.0	26.2	20.2	35.3
World	56.5	45.9	32.4	66.7	66.7	19.0	25.4	9.6	27.7
Iberian	65.2	50.8	45.9	61.f	50.0	18.0	16.7	12.8	27.9
Comet	60.9	52.5	59.5	61.1	50.0	20.0	10.3	12.8	27.3
Daily Star	52.2	27.9	43.2	77.8	50.0	14.0	15.1	1.1	20.6
Average of all 14 Newspapers	64.6	66.9	64.3	77.3	71.7	27.6	26.0	11.4	34.3
Totals	23	61	37	18	6	100	126	94	46

*The Dec. 19 Town Talk was unavailable for study from any source.

KEY: (A) Jury selection/opening arguments; (B) Witnesses for the prosecution; (C) Witnesses for the defense; (D) Closing arguments/jury deliberations; (E) Declaration of mistrial/reactions; (F) Extrajudicial events; (G) Media events; (H) Editorial page events; (I) Total events covered.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

Sum of Events Coverage by Placement

Placement	Events Covered							
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)
Front page	63.8	51.6	61.8	78.4	73.2	30.3	40.9	51.2
Inside page	36.2	48.4	38.2	21.6	26.8	69.6	59.1	49.8
Totals	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0
Sums	208	573	335	194	56	398	459	2223

KEY: (A) Jury selection/opening arguments; (B) Witnesses for the prosecution; (C) Witnesses for the defense; (D) Closing arguments/jury deliberations; (E) Declaration of mistrial/reactions; (F) Extrajudicial events; (G) Media events; (H) Total events covered.

Table 4

Sum of Events Coverage by Headline Type

Headline Type	Events Covered							
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)
Banner	17.3	11.7	14.0	24.9	39.3	11.6	16.1	15.3
Spread	37.0	51.6	49.3	44.6	32.1	40.5	40.5	44.5
Two-column	36.0	24.3	23.9	16.6	26.8	29.8	23.7	25.6
Major 1-column	8.7	11.3	12.2	13.5	0.0	13.6	15.7	12.4
Minor 1-column	1.0	1.0	0.6	0.5	1.8	4.5	4.1	2.2
Totals	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	101.1	100.0
Sums	208	573	335	194	56	398	459	2223

KEY: (A) Jury selection/opening arguments; (B) Witnesses for the prosecution; (C) Witnesses for the defense; (D) Closing arguments/jury deliberations; (E) Declaration of mistrial/reactions; (F) Extrajudicial events; (G) Media events; (H) Total events covered.

Table 5

Sum of Events Coverage by Time Period

Time Period	Events Covered								
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)
Sep 15-28	63.0	0.7	0.3	0.0	0.0	39.4	19.0	17.9	17.1
Sep 29-Oct 12	33.2	27.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.8	14.2	15.9	14.3
Oct 13-26	0.0	27.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.3	14.7	13.2	11.4
Oct 27-Nov 9	0.0	37.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	9.6	13.2	12.6
Nov 10-23	0.0	8.0	54.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	14.9	18.5	15.8
Nov 24-Dec 7	0.0	0.0	45.7	0.0	0.0	6.5	10.1	5.3	9.8
Dec 8-19	3.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	20.6	17.5	15.9	19.0
Totals	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.0
Sums	208	573	335	194	56	398	459	151	2374

KEY: (A) Jury selection/opening arguments; (B) Witnesses for the prosecution; (C) Witnesses for the defense; (D) Closing arguments/jury deliberations; (E) Declaration of mistrial/reactions; (F) Extrajudicial events; (G) Media events; (H) Editorial page events; (I) Total events covered.

Table 6

Sum of Events Coverage by Media Source

Source	Events Covered								
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)
Staff	11.1	17.7	15.8	17.5	30.4	16.3	16.4	7.9	16.1
Bureau	39.4	41.6	42.1	29.4	32.1	36.2	38.6	21.9	37.5
Wire Service	49.5	40.7	42.1	53.1	37.5	47.0	44.1	0.0	41.7
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0.	0.0	0.5	0.9	70.2	4.7
Totals	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sums Totals	208	573	335	194	56	398	459	151	2374

KEY: (A) Jury selection/opening arguments; (B) Witnesses for the prosecution; (C) Witnesses for the defense; (D) Closing arguments/jury deliberations; (E) Declaration of mistrial/reactions; (F) Extrajudicial events; (G) Media events; (H) Editorial page events; (I) Total events covered.

REFERENCES

"A new trial, a new place." (December 19, 1985), Shreveport Journal, Section 1, p. 12A.

Abadinksy, H. (1985) Organized Crime. Second Edition. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Bohm, R. M. (1986) Crime, criminal and crime control myths." Justice Quarterly 3(2):193-214.

"But we aren't laughing." (November 24, 1985) Shreveport Times, Section 2, p. 10B.

Chibnall, S. (1975) "The crime reporter: a study in the production of commerical knowledge." Sociology 9(1): 49-66.

Danielson, W. A. and J. B. Adams (1961) "Completeness of Press Coverage of the 1960 Campaign." Journalism Quarterly 38(Autumn): 441-52.

Dominick, J. R. (1978) "Crime and law enforcement in the mass media." In Deviance and the Mass Media, C. Winick (ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

"Edwards shaky on stand at first." (December 3, 1985),Times-Picayune/States-Item Section I, p. 1A.

Eisenstein, J. and H. Jacob (1977) Felony Justice: An Organizational Analysis of Criminal Courts. NY: Little, Brown.

"False alarms relieve trial tensions." (December 4, 1985), Times-Picayune/States-Item Section I, p. 17A.

Friedman, L. M. and R. V. Percival (1981) The Roots of Justice: Crime and Punishment in Alameda County, California, 1870-1910. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Garofalo, J. (1981) "Crime and the mass media: a selective review of the research." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 18: 319-50.

Hill, J. A. (1986) "The Edwards Trial-The Press on Trial." Presentation to the Southwest Journalism Congress. Baton Rouge, Louisiana, March 7.

Jacob, H. (1984) Justice in America: Courts, Lawyers and the Judicial Profess. Fourth Edition. NY: Little, Brown.

Maginnis, J. (1984) The Last Hayride. Baton Rouge, LA: Gris Gris Press.

Neubauer, D. W. (1984) America's Courts and the Criminal Justice System. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.

Pepinsky, H. and P. Jesilow (1985) Myths that Cause Crime. Cabin John, MD: Seven Locks.

Rhodes, R. B. (1984) Organized Crime: Crime Control vs. Civil Liberties. NY: Random House.

Rubenstein, J. and P. Reuter (1978) "Fact, fancy and organized crime." The Public Interest (Fall): 45-67.

Stempel, G. H., III and J. W. Windhauser (1984) "The prestige press revisited: Coverage of the 1980 presidential campaign." 61 (Spring): 49-55.

Stovall, J. G. (1982) "Foreign policy issue coverage in the 1980 presidential campaign." Journalism Quarterly 59 (Winter): 531-540.

"Time to move on." (December 19, 1985), Shreveport Journal, Section 1, p. 4A.

Walker, S. (1985) Sense and Nonsense About Crime: A Policy Guide.

Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Windhauser, J. W. (1975/76) "How the Ohio metropolitan press reported the Kent State University and other Ohio campus disorders." Mass Communications Review 3(1).

CODES AND CASES

Sheppard v. Maxwell, 384 U.S. 33 (1966).

18 U.S.C. Section 1961 (1970).